

## REMARKS

Claims 1-22 and 24-123 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 13, 20, 27, 46, 58, 65, 77, 82, 85, 100, 106, and 113-118 are independent claims. Claims 46-57, 100-105, and 117 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 1-22 and 24-123 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The prior amendment has also been objected to. In response, certain claims have been amended or cancelled.

### Objection to Prior Amendment

The Amendment filed on September 18, 2006 was objected to as being deemed to introduce new matter. In particular, the Office objected to the claim limitations to “bibliographical information.” In response, the claims have been amended to overcome the objection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### Rejection of Claims Under Section 112

Claims 46-57, 100-105, and 117 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. These rejections are based on the claim limitations to “bibliographical information.” The claims have now been amended to obviate the rejections under section 112.

Reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

### Rejection of Claims Under Section 102

Claims 1-22 and 24-123 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by Burner et al. (U.S. 6,282,548). In response the claims have been amended to clarify the subject matter being claimed. The amendments are not an acquiescence to the rejections.

As previously discussed, Burner discusses a system for displaying metadata concurrently with a web page. The system uses a standard browser and does not require modifications to the HTML code for the web page being viewed. When a user views a web page via a browser, client

software separate from the browser obtains metadata about the page (or its web site) for viewing by the user. While the web page can be retrieved from its web server, the metadata is retrieved from a database server. The database server is coupled to a database containing metadata and a database containing an archive of web pages.

The Burner web page archive maintains a copy of HTML files that have been obtained from web servers by a web crawler. According to Burner, the archived pages server two functions. The main function is to mine metadata for a URL. The other function is to provide an archived copy of the HTML for a web page. In the later case, the user employs a browser to access the archived web page and the archived HTML is processed and displayed in the user's browser window. Because the original HTML is used, selecting a link will direct the user to the web server associated with the linked URL, which may be newer than the archived page or non-existent.

While the metadata could be any data related to a web site, the metadata discussed by Burner are "Where are you" information about the site or page, "Where can I go next" information that suggests related pages to the user, and advertisements. Burner estimates that the storage requirements for the metadata would be approximately 1% of the storage requirement for the web page archive. It appears that older versions of archived web pages may be stored in the metadata database in secondary storage (*see* Col. 6, ll. 6-7).

Unlike web pages, which can be archived, registration information related to the web site is not archived, instead only one version of the registration information is created (the current version). For example, the ownership metadata would identify the current owner of a web site, not necessarily the contemporaneous owner of an archived web site.

In contrast, aspects of the Applicant's invention include a system that stores an archived original content file (such as HTML files) as well as a file having a browser-rendered view of the source file. By also storing rendered views of the source file, a future researcher does not require a browser (possibly long obsolete) that is capable of correctly processing the source file. The researcher, instead, can view the source file as originally written and the stored view of the content, which represents how the content would have appeared through a browser at the time the original content file was archived. Note that the browser-rendered display is stored as a file, and thus is a structural element of the claim and not an intended use.

The subject application also recognizes that it may be important in the future to be able to identify those responsible for posting the original content, even after ownership of a domain has changed hands. A technique is thus described that can store identifying information about a content provider in association with the content. That information can include domain registry information. In particular, that domain registry information is stored as provided by its registrar at the time of archiving. Furthermore, the registry information as well as the source file and rendered file are time stamped in the database.

The archived information from the source file and the registry information is also indexed so that the content itself is searchable within the archive. Content from the files that matches the search criteria can then be retrieved with the associated information about the content provider. This feature can be particularly useful when the content is no longer publicly available via the Internet (e.g. the web site no longer exists or the content has been deleted).

Distinguishable limitations in the claims relate to the above-noted distinctions between the Applicant's invention and Burner and include:

- The invention is distinguishable at least by independent Claims 27, 58, 85, 106, 116, and 118. Each of those claims recite the storage of "a source code file having instructions for operating web browsers" and "a file having an image of a browser-rendered display generated by a web browser as instructed by the source code file" in the data warehouse. Burner does not disclose or suggest the storage of "a file having a browser-rendered display" in its archive. Indeed, Burner only stores the source code and requires a compatible browser to process the source code for display to a user.
- The invention is also distinguishable at least by amended independent Claims 46, 100, and 117. Each of those claims recite that ownership information is changeable over time and the storage of "each version of ownership information in association with a time stamp in a data archive." Burner does not disclose or suggest the storage of multiple versions of registration or ownership information in an archive. Instead, Burner teaches away by maintaining a single version that attempts to be kept up-to-date. There is no way that Burner can reliably identify a party responsible for content on an archived web site.

- The invention is also distinguishable at least by amended independent Claims 1, 13, 20, 65, 77, 82, 113, 114, and 115. Those claims recite the use of an electronic indexing system to facilitate querying of the original content as stored in a file. By indexing the archived files, the Applicant can search for content and retrieve files regardless of age of the archived file. Burner does not disclose or suggest the use of an indexing system to query the contents of archived files. Instead, Burner requires the entry of a known URL to access the archive of a known web site.

As such, the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from Burner. Reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**R.D. Johnson & Associates, P.C.**

By           /Rodney D. Johnson/          

**Rodney D. Johnson**

**Registration No. 36,558**

Telephone: (781) 444-6844

Facsimile: (617) 412-3081

Dated: June 19, 2007